

AU/ACSC/JOHNKE/AY12

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE
AIR UNIVERSITY

**THE NEW GUINEA CAMPAIGN OF THE SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA:
A DEMONSTRATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF JOINT OPERATIONS**

Digital Collections

by

Barton L. Johnke, Major, USA

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Dr. Paul Springer

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

April 2012

United States military operations in the Pacific during World War II proved to serve as one of the first truly joint combat opportunities in the history of the U.S. military. Specifically, the Allied operations in and around New Guinea demonstrated a unique confluence of geographic and operational factors that required joint operations to effectively execute a military campaign. Although the Air Force did not exist as a separate service at this time, the concept of integrating air, land, and sea forces nevertheless draws similar parallels to today's joint force structure. As such, using current joint doctrine to evaluate this historic campaign can provide a framework to highlight some of the reasons for success as well as validation of the usefulness of the doctrine for future campaigns. To effectively evaluate this campaign through the vehicle of joint doctrine, it must not only encompass the actual effects of operations, but also should include the planned effects of the operations. Using the principles of joint operations as a common thread to link planning through execution and the resultant effects will highlight the continuity of the effectual use of the principles of joint operations in warfare.

Military planners often use the traditional nine principles of war as guiding factors to shape the strategic, operational, and tactical use of joint forces. The traditional nine principles are: objective, offensive, mass, maneuver, economy of force, unity of command, security, surprise, simplicity.¹ Current U.S. joint doctrine includes three additional principles (restraint, perseverance, and legitimacy) which “are born out of experience across the range of military operations.”² The inclusion of these three additional principles highlights the changing views and evolution of the principles of joint operations as experienced through military actions since World War II which often included unconventional warfare. At the time of the New Guinea Campaign, numerous changes in technology, doctrine, political factors, competing strategies and supply inadequacies all forced Pacific theatre commanders to evaluate the effective use of

military forces across the range of operations as well.³ The New Guinea Campaign demonstrates the enduring qualities of the traditional principles of war as a means to employ forces even in the midst of dramatic change. The three non-traditional principles primarily focus on the cause and effect relationship of military action on politics, morality, national will and the relationship to valid national strategy.⁴ One could argue that the New Guinea Campaign served to bolster public opinion which favored MacArthur and his promise to return to the Phillipines, thereby influencing perseverance and legitimacy principles.⁵ However, it would be difficult to argue that these factors played a significant role in the campaign's influence upon WWII, a war widely recognized as needed for the very survival of the United States. As such this analysis will focus on the nine traditional principles of war which coincide with the first nine principles of joint operations.

Before examining the principles of war, it is important to establish the setting for the campaign in New Guinea. Terrain and operational context are two important factors that influence the application of the principles of joint operations. The formidable terrain, climate and wildlife throughout New Guinea ensured that land forces alone could not conquer the island. New Guinea's vast size, the second largest island in the world (stretching over 1,300 miles in length and an area larger than Texas), is divided sharply by a mountain range reaching heights of 14,000 feet and covered by thick jungle vegetation that effectively divides the island in half along its long axis. The close proximity of numerous smaller islands capable of providing bases to mutually support defensive or offensive naval and air bases further contributed to the inherent requirement for joint operations. In its totality, New Guinea and the nearby regions presented a truly formidable region of strategic and operational significance that would require joint coordination to dominate.⁶

Operationally, the picture in mid-1942 showed that the Japanese empire had effectively established a defensive perimeter that included New Guinea as a large portion of their southern border. The Japanese setbacks at Midway and Coral Sea fundamentally changed their strategy into one that would rely on an effective defense in depth throughout the numerous islands in the Pacific theatre. Not only did New Guinea represent the largest island in the region, its location and control posed a threat to the Australian mainland and Allied lines of communication. Regardless of the likelihood of an invasion of the Australian mainland, the strategic importance of New Guinea remained prominent. Furthermore, the fact that Japan did not control the entire island of New Guinea, created vulnerabilities in their defensive plans. Allied control of Port Moresby and the Papuan peninsula presented a direct threat to Japanese defenses and it restricted the Japanese ability to influence the rapidly building American supplies in Australia. Clearly, in the early stages of the war in the Pacific, both sides recognized the importance of New Guinea.⁷

Forced with the requirement to defend Australia and ultimately conduct offensive operations against Japan, it became readily apparent that the Solomon Islands and New Guinea region would serve as the beginning point for offensive operations in the Pacific. After much deliberation between the Navy and Army view points of strategy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) approved of the plan to unleash General MacArthur to capture Rabaul, the main Japanese base in the area. To do this, MacArthur would command forces in the Southwest Pacific Area (SWPA) during the New Guinea Campaign. MacArthur arranged the SWPA into four primary commands: Allied Air Forces commanded by General George C. Kenney, Allied Land Forces commanded by General Sir Thomas Blarney and Allied Naval Forces commanded by Vice Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid. Another command called the Alamo Force under Lieutenant General Walter Krueger included the majority of U.S. Army land forces. Additional naval forces

were allocated to SWPA for Operation Cartwheel but were not permanently assigned. Specifically, the JCS order stated that Admiral Halsey would follow MacArthur's "general directives."⁸ With this understanding of the situation, we can proceed to analyze the use of the principles of joint operations as applied to the New Guinea Campaign.⁹

Objective: JP 3-0 defines the principle of objective as "the purpose of specifying the objective is to direct every military operation toward a clearly defined, decisive, and achievable goal...objectives must directly, quickly, and economically contribute to the purpose of the operation...changes to the military objectives may occur because political and military leaders gain a better understanding of the situation, or they may occur because the situation itself changes."¹⁰

Eventually, after much debate, the ultimate strategy to militarily defeat Japan relied upon a central Pacific advance by Admiral Nimitz's forces and a southern Pacific advance by forces under the command of MacArthur. However, initial planning during the Casablanca conference in 1942 focused primarily on defining what objectives could be achieved in the secondary theatre in order to allow time to first defeat Germany. As such "there was no overall Pacific strategy" at the onset of operations in the area, rather the sides all agreed that Rabaul must be taken to set the conditions for future offensive operation in the theatre.¹¹ This spawned what became known as tasks two and three from the Joint Directive for Offensive Operations in the Southwest Pacific Area. This effectively set the offensive stage to seize New Guinea and the islands affecting the seizure of Rabaul. It also opened the door for MacArthur to race towards the Phillipines to add leverage to his argument for overall strategy which focused upon a southern approach to Japan through the Phillipines.¹²

MacArthur's overarching intent for the campaign as it supported his strategic plan for the Pacific "contemplates massive strokes against only main strategic objectives" which would allow him to "end the war as soon and as cheaply as possible."¹³ The New Guinea campaign itself served as a means to invade a key strategic objective of the Phillipines. Within the campaign itself, several successive objectives were established that shaped the combat operations. This overarching intent demonstrates that the objectives nested from the tactical to the strategic level in accordance with the objective principle of joint operations.¹⁴

As highlighted in JP 3-0 the definition and description of the principle also includes a potential for evolution of objectives based on situational factors. MacArthur adjusted his selection of key objectives based upon the overall situation demonstrating a sound and thorough alignment with this principle. From the initial defensive posture of Allied forces to the conclusion of operations in the region, MacArthur's objectives supported higher objectives but also acknowledged the changing situation. Ironically, the very geographic landscape New Guinea and the surrounding islands presented "clearly defined, decisive, and achievable goal(s)" and objectives.¹⁵ However, MacArthur claimed to select specific objectives for very specific reasons that align directly with joint doctrine to select objectives based on direct, rapid and economy of force factors as well as the "selection of objectives which could be held once they were won."¹⁶

Offensive: "The purpose of an offensive action is to seize, retain, and exploit the initiative. Offensive operations are the means by which a military force seizes and holds the initiative while maintaining freedom of action and achieving decisive results. Commanders adopt the defensive only as a temporary expedient and must seek every opportunity to seize or regain the initiative."¹⁷

The New Guinea Campaign which was primarily conducted by offensive actions has multiple examples of assaults, attacks, and raids that obviously demonstrate the offensive principle of joint operations. Significantly, this principle also includes defensive actions, with the caveat that it must serve a temporary purpose to initiate offensive operations at a later time. This highlights another important aspect of the New Guinea Campaign and its ability to thoroughly highlight the effective application this principle. As discussed earlier, Japanese strength and initial successes at the onset of hostilities caught the U.S. off guard and left MacArthur in a defensive posture when he established his headquarters in Australia.¹⁸ MacArthur's offensive spirit surfaced even as he planned the defenses at Port Moresby and Milne Bay. The underlying purpose for his defensive plans and actions usefully served to establish the future successes of the New Guinea Campaign. During the defense of Wau in the first two months of 1943, Allied air attacks decimated the Japanese reinforcements attempting to pour into the Papuan peninsula in an attempt to take control of the rest of New Guinea. Intercepting critical messages, Kenney launched attacks on troop transports and successfully blocked the additional troops. Effectively ending Japanese plans for the offensive, the initiative had shifted to the Allies. Combined with the earlier Japanese setbacks at Midway and Coral Sea, the operational window opened for MacArthur to initiate the offensive from his defensive positions in Australia and the Papuan peninsula. In communications to the War department, he asserted that the events "should be exploited by immediate offensive action."¹⁹

While on the offensive throughout the campaign, MacArthur planned offensive objectives that he knew he could retain as he bypassed Japanese strong points to "seize, retain, and exploit the initiative."²⁰ Combining the objectives with speed, logistical attacks, and flexibility, the efforts during the New Guinea Campaign effectively ensured the Japanese forces

could not regroup and regain the initiative they previously lost. These examples pooled with the inherent offensive nature of the campaign demonstrate a thorough and complete example of the offensive principle of joint operations.

Mass: “The purpose of mass is to concentrate the effects of combat power at the most advantageous place and time to produce decisive results. In order to achieve mass, appropriate joint force capabilities are integrated and synchronized where they will have a decisive effect in a short period of time. Mass often must be sustained to have the desired effect. Massing effects of combat power, rather than concentrating forces, can enable even numerically inferior forces to produce decisive results and minimize human losses and waste of resources.”²¹

Typically members of the Army quickly assume that examples of the principle of mass must include maneuvering a reserve force or overwhelming force into an enemy vulnerability at the decisive point of battle. However, as JP 3-0 defines, mass includes the concentration of synchronized effects of combat power, not necessarily just a concentration of forces. The air and naval attacks against Rabaul effectively demonstrated how the effects of massing synchronized combat power proved decisive at a crucial point.

The strategic location of Rabaul allowed a central point for the large Japanese forces to support numerous islands in the area with combat and logistical support. During planning, SWPA intelligence estimates pointed to the crucial factor that the Japanese force might “be able to muster ten to fifteen divisions and 755 aircraft” to reinforce the defensive positions targeted by Operation Cartwheel.²² Massing effects of combat power to diminish the capabilities at Rabaul would prove decisive to destroy the ability of the enemy to leverage these reinforcements. Unable to immediately use ground forces, Kenney and Halsey planned, coordinated, and executed devastating attacks on Rabaul by massing the effects of air and naval

forces. Kenney massed 349 airplanes to effectively conduct aerial attacks against Rabaul while Halsey deviated from carrier doctrine and moved the carriers within range of Japanese land based planes to compliment the aerial attack. Halsey massed cruisers into a daring attack under the cover of darkness to achieve surprise as well, and leveled additional devastating attacks. In the end, these joint attacks within MacArthur's SWPA command devastated Rabaul to such an extent that Japanese forces could not and would not try to recover from.²³

Additionally, these attacks came at an extremely low cost to the attacking forces, specifically not a single carrier or cruiser was lost during the daring and non-doctrinal attacks. The astounding success also allowed MacArthur to avoid attacking New Britain, saving even more forces and combat power, further proving that the decisive effects of massing effects through an efficient use of force.²⁴

Maneuver: “The purpose of maneuver is to place the enemy in a position of disadvantage through the flexible application of combat power. Maneuver is the movement of forces in relation to the enemy to secure or retain positional advantage, usually in order to deliver—or threaten delivery of—the direct and indirect fires of the maneuvering force.”²⁵

Similar to the principle of objective, the geographic and operational factors of the New Guinea campaign innately begged for application of the principle of maneuver. Under MacArthur’s direction, Allied forces leap frogged from the southeastern corner and proceeded northwesterly along the coast of New Guinea. Each leap bypassed a Japanese position, effectively using maneuver to isolate the enemy, often forcing the Japanese to abandon their location. Shockingly, the successive amphibious assaults “to leap 1,300 miles in just 100 days” effectively gained control of the island of New Guinea and set the conditions to advance to the Phillipines.²⁶ Not only did these maneuvers achieve tactical victory upon New Guinea, but they

directly contributed to the operational victory to neutralize the Japanese position on Rabaul. Combined with the Halsey's prong of Operation Cartwheel the Allied advances effectively placed the Japanese forces at Rabaul in a positional disadvantage; isolated and ineffective the Japanese struggled to even survive.²⁷

The operations at Lae provide another sterling example of a joint force using maneuver in alignment with the definition from JP 3-0.²⁸ Planned extensively to integrate air assets, naval indirect fire support, ground maneuver of landed forces, and airborne operations; MacArthur's joint forces set out to use maneuver to win a tactical victory with operational impact. As planned, operations at Lae utilized air, sea, and land forces simultaneously maneuvering around Japanese positions to gain a positional advantage that could exploit weaknesses in the enemy. Of note, this operation also included Australian forces, adding another unique joint facet to the campaign as a whole. Airborne drops and amphibious landings on key terrain out of reach from direct fire of the enemy positioned Allied forces in a manner which allowed them to approach Lae from three separate directions. Confused as to the actual Allied objectives and realizing the futility of their position in light of the superior threat, Japanese commanders ordered withdrawal from Lae after limited combat.²⁹

Economy of Force: “The purpose of economy of force is to expend minimum essential combat power on secondary efforts in order to allocate the maximum possible combat power on primary efforts.”³⁰

As stated previously, MacArthur planned objectives that facilitated by maneuver and mass that would “obviate the need for storming the mass of islands now in enemy possession.”³¹ During the execution of the leapfrogging action along New Guinea’s coast, Allied forces were often spread thinly throughout the area, allowing a minimum amount of forces to effectively

control the vast island. Although some would contend that the action made forces vulnerable, MacArthur argued that the forces would be protected by the naval and air forces while allowing a concentration of forces against more vital objectives. The concentrated attacks on the Admiralties which helped secure the exposed flank of New Guinea forces demonstrated just such a balancing of forces.³² This directly dovetails into what JP 3-0 would classify as the “judicious employment and distribution of forces” in order to “achieve mass elsewhere at the decisive point and time.”³³

Positive views of the New Guinea Campaign commonly highlight the perception that the successful campaign resulted in significantly lower casualties and loss of combat power than did other campaigns during WWII. Arguably other factors played a significant role in the disparate results, but the fact remains that the operation highlights an effective demonstration of the economical use of forces. Australian Prime Minister John Curtin and General George C. Marshall also recognized the success and praised MacArthur’s plan as a model for success with relatively low losses while causing significant losses to the isolated enemy and conquering a vast expanse of territory. It is important to note that this principle is inextricably linked to the principles of maneuver, mass and surprise. Not surprisingly, the positive demonstration of these principles likely affected the tremendously success as measured by the economy of force.³⁴

Unity of Command: “The purpose of unity of command is to ensure unity of effort under one responsible commander for every objective. Unity of command means that all forces operate under a single commander with the requisite authority to direct all forces employed in pursuit of a common purpose”...”Unity of effort—the coordination and cooperation toward common objectives, even if the participants are not necessarily part of the same command or organization—is the product of successful unified action.”³⁵

During the planning phase, MacArthur clearly recognized the importance that unity of command would play during the operation. In official communication to higher headquarters MacArthur stated that “if correct procedure is not followed it makes a mockery of the unity of command theory, which was the basis of the organizational plan applied to the Pacific Theatre.”³⁶ This mindset manifested in his command as he established and organized his forces. Although his command looked from the outside like a standard Army headquarters, in actuality it “was an inter-Allied, inter-service command exercising operational and policy-making functions” and “Allied combat operations were conducted through four operational headquarters subordinate to General MacArthur; the Allied Air Forces, the Allied Land Forces, the Allied Naval Forces, and ALAMO Force.”³⁷

Numerous historians and individuals interested in the Pacific theatre have rightly focused on the dual and often competing commands and inter-service rivalries between the Army and Navy in the Pacific theatre. Disputes over who would control what forces and where they would control them plagued the U.S. military efforts in the theatre. In spite of the theatre level unity of command issues, MacArthur managed to adhere to the principle in his command. Interestingly, MacArthur basically created what currently could be classified as a Joint Task Force (JTF) Headquarters organized into functional component commands with the inclusion of a subordinate JTF called Alamo. Furthermore, where significant conflicts remained with the Admiral Nimitz, MacArthur adhered to the concept of Unity of Effort as demonstrated with his direction of Admiral Halsey’s forces. Arguably this relationship did prove problematic at times, however historians do point out that Halsey and MacArthur actually worked quite well together largely due to Halsey’s diplomatic conduct in the relationship.³⁸

Ironically, the challenges facing the entire Pacific theatre, and resulting two prong attack through the Pacific, actually accelerated the advance of U.S. forces as the actual events unfolded. The two prong attack (arguably a strategy stumbled upon by inter-service rivalries, geographic factors and disagreements during initial strategic planning) effectively kept the Japanese off balance as they tried to balance their dwindling forces, often splitting their forces as they dealt with similar inter-service rivalries.³⁹

MacArthur's dominating style of command and stubborn tenacity to maintain strict operational control of his forces allowed him to maintain disciplined adherence to unity of command. General Kenney, MacArthur's commander of Allied Air Forces, even placed his headquarters in the same building as MacArthur's, which allowed them to work and travel together.⁴⁰ Furthermore, MacArthur planned for and executed his plans in a manner which aligned the movement of land, air, and naval forces to mutually support each other as they achieved objectives. Land based objectives would support movement of airstrips and bases to extend their reach which in turn supported additional movements of land forces. This concept both in plan and execution demonstrated MacArthur's emphasis to maintain unity of command and unity of effort. However, during the planned assault of Cape Gloucester, MacArthur did violate the principle in part when he "specifically directed that Allied Air and Naval Forces would operate under GHQ through their respective commanders and exempted them from control by ALAMO or New Guinea Forces."⁴¹ This deviates from JP 3-0 by not placing all forces in command of the force fighting for the objective. It could be argued that this maintained a unity of effort in accordance with JP 3-0, but the purpose for the command structure in this situation was to potentially deviate the air forces to a threatened area as necessary.⁴² However,

the resultant success during a large campaign points to the conclusion that the various commands involved all worked in concert to achieve MacArthur's plans for the campaign.

Security: “The purpose of security is to prevent the enemy from acquiring unexpected advantage. Security enhances freedom of action by reducing friendly vulnerability to hostile acts, influence, or surprise. Security results from the measures taken by commanders to protect their forces. Application of this principle includes prudent risk management, not undue caution.”⁴³

The most visible potential to jeopardize the security of Allied forces presented itself along the northern coast of New Guinea as MacArthur executed his rapid and successive amphibious assaults along the northern coast. Some significant criticism focuses on the heavy emphasis MacArthur placed upon the speed of the New Guinea campaign to leap frog up the coast. Critics argue that he placed the speed of the operation ahead of the security of the operations, often resulting in exposed flanks; arguing that only luck and Japanese preoccupation with Nimitz's forces precluded a devastating Japanese counterattack. However, the mere existence of seemingly exposed flanks does not necessarily violate the principle of security. The principle accounts for risk management in such a case, a notion MacArthur thought through during the campaign. Acknowledging the exposed flanks, MacArthur reasoned that the flanks could be protected by both land based air forces and naval forces. Furthermore, the security relied upon Nimitz's push through the central Pacific. Specifically the operations at the Palau Islands would occupy or destroy Japanese forces that would otherwise threaten his flank. This acceptable risk would allow the rapid advance along the New Guinea coast and “quickly achieve one important strategic objective—cutting the Japanese lines of communication to the Indies.”⁴⁴

The thorough thought and acceptance of potential risk in light of significant benefits does in fact align with the principle of security even though taken at face value it may seem otherwise.⁴⁵

Kenney's plans to defend the Lae offensive from Japanese air attacks points to an imaginative plan for security and also proves as an interesting anecdote. Kenney understood the weather patterns in the area and knew that fog patterns could block Japanese planes. This "would keep Japanese aircraft away while bright clear weather over New Guinea" would allow Allied air operations to continue.⁴⁶ During the amphibious landings near Lae, the Japanese "dispatched eighty planes from Rabaul to attack Barbey but these were delayed by the fog over New Britain that Kenney's weathermen had predicted" and allowed sufficient time to facilitate the landings while safe from aerial attacks.⁴⁷ Although not a decisive factor in the success, it does reinforce the mindset of Allied commanders manage risk as a means of security.

Surprise: "The purpose of surprise is to strike at a time or place or in a manner for which the enemy is unprepared. Surprise can help the commander shift the balance of combat power and thus achieve success well out of proportion to the effort expended."⁴⁸

Although not used as a primary or decisive principle in the military strategy for the New Guinea Campaign, the actions did routinely plan for and highlight the concept. On several occasions the numerous amphibious landings did manage to keep the Japanese off balance and guessing as to the intent of Allied objectives. For example, at New Georgia the "landings took Japanese at location by surprise, but also surprised those at Rabaul."⁴⁹ Additionally, Allied plans did occasionally seek to deliberately confuse the Japanese. At Lae, deceptive tactics were employed to force "the Japanese to believe that Salamaua and not Lae was the real objective, and so to strengthen Salamaua at Lae's expense."⁵⁰ The plans and execution during operations at Lae reflect the successful nature of the surprise and confusion caused by the deceptions.

In reference to the joint aspect of the campaign, air operations also achieved positive results through effectively surprising the enemy. General Kenney's planned air attacks at Wewak proved successful largely because they "caught most of the enemy planes on the ground."⁵¹ As highlighted previously, the daring attacks at Rabaul also benefitted from the use of surprise to effectively conduct air and naval attacks.

MacArthur did relish the chance to use surprise throughout his career. In this campaign, he did on one occasion rely "almost entirely upon surprise for success" as evident by plans and execution of attacks upon the Admiralties.⁵² The demonstrated uses of surprise show a useful balance of the principle in conjunction with the other principles of joint operations.

Simplicity: "The purpose of simplicity is to increase the probability that plans and operations will be executed as intended by preparing clear, uncomplicated plans and concise orders. Simple plans and clear, concise orders minimize misunderstanding and confusion. Simplicity in plans allows better understanding and execution planning at all echelons."⁵³

Strategic plans sent to MacArthur concerning the two primary tasks assigned to his command consisted of only a few concisely worded paragraphs.⁵⁴ The two specific tasks, referred to as Tasks Two and Three, identified seizing of objectives to deny the area to the Japanese forces. In particular they directed the capture of Rabaul, New Guinea, Lae and other surrounding islands. This order spawned the Elkton Plan, a plan which demonstrated remarkable simplicity for a large dual pronged offensive operation to achieve the objectives outlined in Tasks Two and Three. The Elkton Plan, or Operation Cartwheel, established supporting objectives and tasks that would support the JCS directive to capture Rabaul. The plan laid out simple but clearly defined objectives with simple event driven sequences as needed. The simplicity of these plans, while focused on the operational objectives allowed commanders to

flexibly react to a dynamic battle space. Additionally, the approved plan also specifically gave wide latitude to subordinate commanders by stressing that the successive objectives did not imply an exact timeline to coordinate and allowed commanders to “exploit favorable conditions and take advantage of the momentum achieved by either advance.”⁵⁵ The Elkton Plan’s effects stemming from its simplicity combined with MacArthur’s methods of command resulted in dramatic effects during the operations on New Guinea.⁵⁶

The New Guinea Campaign highlighted perhaps one of the most poignantly effective demonstrations of the principles of joint operations in modern conventional warfare. Interestingly, the application of the principles throughout the campaign in a mutually supporting manner highlights the need for a balancing act when effectively applying the principles in joint operations. For example, in the plan for Operation Cartwheel required mutually supporting attacks up the New Guinea coast and across the Solomon Islands from Guadalcanal. This plan laid out a relatively simple plan, that benefitted from the unity of command established when MacArthur organized his SWPA forces. Furthermore, the complimentary use of maneuver, surprise and mass resulted in a successful use of economy during the final stages of the campaign as forces leaped up the New Guinea coast.

The definitions for the nine traditional principles of joint operations almost perfectly define and explain the reasons for success of the New Guinea Campaign. Of course, material advantages and technology played tremendous roles, but they cannot solely explain the rapid and cost effective success of the campaign. New technology and physical traits that defined the campaign’s operational context presented the opportunity for tremendous success or failure based largely upon the proper integration of joint forces. General MacArthur’s adept planning and execution adhered to the principles of joint operations and ultimately resulted in arguably

one of the most decisive joint campaigns of the war. As emphasized in *Cartwheel: The Reduction of Rabaul*, the New Guinea Campaign success is glorified as one that if ever “a series of offensives was conducted according to plan, it was the extremely systematic Allied moves in the Pacific that started in 1943.”⁵⁷ Ironically, MacArthur seemed to ignore the timeless benefits of the enduring usefulness of the principles of war. When MacArthur laid out his strategic plans, he concluded by stating that new methods and ways were needed to succeed as a result of the changes presented in the Pacific theatre. He emphasized that “Wars are never won in the past” when in fact the doctrinal principles that contributed greatly to his success did in fact lie in the past.⁵⁸

¹ JP 1, I-2, I-3.

² Ibid., ix.

³ Taafe, *MacArthur's Jungle War*. 6.

⁴ JP 3-0, A-3-A-5.

⁵ Taafe, *MacArthur's Jungle War*. 20.

⁶ Morton, *Strategy and Command*. 5.
New Guinea, 3-4.

Taafe, *MacArthur's Jungle War*. 32.

⁷ Morton, *Strategy and Command*. 217, 275, 284-290.

Williams, *Chronology 1941-1945*. 35-42.
Papua, 3-5.

⁸ Miller, *Cartwheel*, 18.

⁹ Morton, *Strategy and Command*. 252.
The Approach to the Phillipines, 14.

¹⁰ JP 3-0, A-1.

¹¹ Ross, *Strategic Plans*. 279.

¹² Ross, *Strategic Plans*. 267.

Miller, *Cartwheel*, 6-8.

¹³ *Reports of MacArthur*, 100.

¹⁴ Taafe, *MacArthur's Jungle War*. 234.

¹⁵ JP 3-0, A-1.

¹⁶ *Reports of MacArthur*, 58.

Willoughby, *MacArthur: 1941-1951*, 5

¹⁷ JP 3-0, A-1.

¹⁸ Milner, *Victory in Papua*, 30-32.

¹⁹ *Reports of MacArthur*, 55.

New Guinea, 5.

²⁰ JP 3-0, A-1.

Reports of MacArthur, 58.

²¹ JP 3-0, A-2.

²² Miller, *Cartwheel*, 30.

-
- ²³ Potter, *Sea Power*, 315.
Gailey, *The War in the Pacific*, 240-242.
- ²⁴ Potter, *Sea Power*, 315.
Gailey, *The War in the Pacific*, 240-242.
- ²⁵ JP 3-0, A-2.
- ²⁶ Gailey, *The War in the Pacific*, 224-226.
New Guinea, 30.
- ²⁷ Gailey, *The War in the Pacific*, 242-246.
- ²⁸ Ibid., 224-226.
- ²⁹ Gailey, *The War in the Pacific*, 224-226.
Miller, *Cartwheel*, 202-212.
- ³⁰ JP 3-0, A-2.
- ³¹ *Reports of MacArthur*, 100.
- ³² *Reports of MacArthur*, 100, 140-142.
Taafe, *MacArthur's Jungle War*. 236.
- ³³ JP 3-0, A-2.
- ³⁴ Taafe, *MacArthur's Jungle War*. 1-2,234-235.
- ³⁵ JP 3-0, A-2.
- ³⁶ *Reports of MacArthur*, 58.
- ³⁷ Smith, *The Approach to the Phillipines*, 14.
- ³⁸ Gailey, *The War in the Pacific*, 227.
- ³⁹ Gray and Barnett, *Seapower and Strategy*, 263.
- ⁴⁰ Griffith, *MacArthur's Airmen*, 69.
- ⁴¹ Miller, *Cartwheel*, 276.
- ⁴² Miller, *Cartwheel*, 276.
Reports of MacArthur, 113.
- ⁴³ JP 3-0, A-3.
- ⁴⁴ Morton, *Strategy and Command*. 3.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid., 3.
New Guinea, 18-25.
- ⁴⁶ Miller, *Cartwheel*, 192.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., 205.
- ⁴⁸ JP 3-0, A-3.
- ⁴⁹ Miller, *Cartwheel*, 89.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., 190.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., 199.
- ⁵² *Reports of MacArthur*, 138.
- ⁵³ JP 3-0, A-3.
- ⁵⁴ Ross, *Strategic Plans*. 267.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., 273.
- ⁵⁶ Ross, *Strategic Plans*. 271-277.
Taafe, *MacArthur's Jungle War*. 234-235.
- ⁵⁷ Miller, *Cartwheel*, 225.
- ⁵⁸ *Reports of MacArthur*, 100.

Bibliography

- Gailey, Harry A. *The War in the Pacific: From Pearl Harbor to Tokyo Bay*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press: 1995.
- General Staff. *Reports of General MacArthur: The Campaigns of MacArthur in the Pacific, Volume I*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994.
- Gray, Colin S., and Roger W. Barnett. *Seapower and Strategy*. Annapolis, MD: U.S. Naval Institute Press, 1989.
- Griffith, Thomas E. Jr. *MacArthur's Airmen: General George C. Kenney and the War in the Southwest Pacific*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1998.
- Joint Publication (JP) 1. *Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States*. 2 MAY 2007, incorporating Change 1, 20 MAR 2009.
- Joint Publication (JP) 3-0. *Joint Operations*. 11 August 2011.
- Miller, John Jr. *Carthwheel: The Reduction of Rabaul*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959.
- Milner, Samuel. *Victory in Papua*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989.
- Morton, Louis. *Strategy and Command: The First Two Years*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.
- Potter, E. B. *Sea Power: A Naval History, 2nd Edition*. Annapolis, MD: U.S. Naval Institute Press, 1981.
- Ross, Steven T., ed. *U.S. War Plans: 1938-1945*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2002.
- Smith, Robert R. *The Approach to the Phillipines*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996.
- Taafe, Stephen R. *MacArthur's Jungle War: The 1944 New Guinea Campaign*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press: 1998.
- Wiloughby, Charles A. *MacArthur: 1941-1951*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1954
- Williams, Mary H. *Chronology: 1941-1945*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989.

The U.S. Army Campaigns of World War II: New Guinea. CMH PUB 72-9.

The U.S. Army Campaigns of World War II: Papua. CMH PUB 72-7.

